

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 32-94 are pending in the application. Claims 32-34 and 78-80 have been amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Applicant submits that the pending claims 32-94 are patentable over the art of record and allowance is respectfully requested of claims 32-94.

Claims 32 and 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Project Plan (hereinafter PP) Name Searching Research Project Phase 2, 6/14/1996, pages 1-18. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants would like to point out that the PP reference was prepared by Applicants while they were performing research under a government contract. Applicants believe that their activities, including preparation of the PP reference, should be classified as experimentation. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the PP reference should not be cited. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicants will address the rejections herein.

Anticipation requires that the identical invention must be shown in a single reference in as complete detail as is contained in the claims. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Amended claims 32 and 78 describe classifying a text input name as belonging to a particular culture by using at least one of a high frequency name data store of names that occur frequently in particular cultures, a morphological element, a string of letters that occur with statistical significance in particular cultures, and one of a title, an affix, and a qualifier of the text input name (e.g. Specification, page 11, line 11 – page 12, line 11); accessing the text input name entered as an input name by one or more of a user or a system; determining multiple phonetic representations for a portion of the text input name, each of the multiple phonetic representations being for a different pronunciation of the text input name; comparing each of the multiple phonetic representations of the portion of the text input name to a phonetic representation of a portion of a text known name stored in a database; and providing an indication of whether the text input name matches the text known name based on the comparing. Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 32 and 78 are not anticipated by the PP reference.

Dependent claims 33-77 and 79-94 incorporate the language of independent claims 32 and 78, respectively, and add additional novel elements. Therefore, dependent claims 33-77 and

79-94 are not anticipated by the PP reference for at least the same reasons as were discussed with respect to claims 32 and 78.

Claims 32-94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Final Report (Name Searching Research Project Phase 2, May 31, 1997, pages 1-67). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicants would like to point out that the Final Report reference was prepared by Applicants while they were performing research under a government contract. Applicants believe that their activities, including preparation of the Final Report reference, should be classified as experimentation. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the Final Report reference should not be cited. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicants will address the rejections herein.

Anticipation requires that the identical invention must be shown in a single reference in as complete detail as is contained in the claims. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Amended claims 32 and 78 describe classifying a text input name as belonging to a particular culture by using at least one of a high frequency name data store of names that occur frequently in particular cultures, a morphological element, a string of letters that occur with statistical significance in particular cultures, and one of a title, an affix, and a qualifier of the text input name (e.g. Specification, page 11, line 11 – page 12, line 11); accessing the text input name entered as an input name by one or more of a user or a system; determining multiple phonetic representations for a portion of the text input name, each of the multiple phonetic representations being for a different pronunciation of the text input name; comparing each of the multiple phonetic representations of the portion of the text input name to a phonetic representation of a portion of a text known name stored in a database; and providing an indication of whether the text input name matches the text known name based on the comparing. Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 32 and 78 are not anticipated by the Final Report reference. Instead, the Final Report reference describes that the presence of an automated name classifier (page 6, Section 3.3.2 Assumptions), but there is no description of the claimed classifying a text input name as belonging to a particular culture by using at least one of a high frequency name data store of names that occur frequently in particular cultures, a morphological element, a string of

letters that occur with statistical significance in particular cultures, and one of a title, an affix, and a qualifier of the text input name.

Dependent claims 33-77 and 79-94 incorporate the language of independent claims 32 and 78, respectively, and add additional novel elements. Therefore, dependent claims 33-77 and 79-94 are not anticipated by the Final Report reference for at least the same reasons as were discussed with respect to claims 32 and 78.

In addition, MPEP Section 706.02(a) "Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(a), (b), or (c); Printed Publication or Patent [R-3] - 700 Examination of Applications", "II. DETERMINING WHETHER TO APPLY 35 U.S.C. 102(a), (b), or (c)", "C. 35 U.S.C. 102(a)", states:

For 35 U.S.C. 102(a) to apply, the reference must have a publication date earlier in time than the effective filing date of the application, and must not be applicant's own work.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Final Report document cited by the Examiner is Applicants' own work. With this Amendment, Applicants are submitting a Declaration signed by one of the Applicants', Leonard Arthur Shaefer, stating that the Final Report document is Applicants' own work.

Thus, Applicants' submit that the Final Report document may not be used in the 35 U.S.C. 102(a) rejection. Applicants' respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 102(a) rejection citing the Final Report document.

Conclusion

Applicant has not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact her at (310) 553-7973 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: April 17, 2007

By: ____/Janaki K. Davda____

Janaki K. Davda
Registration No. 40,684

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984